

Appln. No. 10/782,105  
Amendment dated April 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed December 16, 2005

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 through 8 and 10 through 12 remain in this application. Claims 2, 3, and 9 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

It is submitted that the "finality" of the §112 rejection made in the Office Action and discussed below is premature, as this §112 rejection was never previously set forth in any of the preceding Office Actions (the Office Action preceding this "final" Office Action included only a §102(b) rejection). Thus, applicant has not had any opportunity prior to this "final" Office Action to clarify or explain the matters raised in the new §112 rejection. Withdrawal of the finality of the rejection, or allowance of all of the claims, is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 through 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite.

The above amendments to the claims are believed to clarify the requirements of the rejected claims, especially the particular points identified in the Office Action. Specifically, the rejection of the Office Action states that:

Each of the independent claims state that "said first portion being coupled to said second portion for being inserted into the housing to depress clips." This contradicts the description which states that "The second portion 24 is designed for being inserted into the housing 3 to depress clips 4 of the clip member" (specification, page 6).

Appln. No. 10/782,105  
Amendment dated April 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed December 16, 2005

It is submitted that any confusion that may have been caused by the language of the claims has been remedied by the simple inclusion of the words " , said second portion" in each of claims 1, 7, and 8. It is therefore submitted that the language of the claims has been further clarified to be consistent with the language of the specification.

The rejection further states:

Further each of the independent claims states "a perimeter wall... for receiving the parking brake cable". It is unclear what it meant by this statement. This appears to suggest that the cable is being threaded through the bore such that the perimeter wall is solid for 360 degrees which is an embodiment not suggested in the description. The claim lacks sufficient structure for the use recited inasmuch as there is no structure in the claim to facilitate the perimeter wall receiving the cable through the radial portion of the perimeter wall. For example, the claim should have a limitation such as "the perimeter wall having means for receiving the cable through a radial portion of the perimeter wall" in order to provide sufficient structure capable of performing the intended use recited in the claim.

Initially, it is submitted that claim 7 as previously presented did not suffer from this alleged shortcoming, as claim 7 previously required in part "said perimeter wall comprising a slot, said slot extending through said perimeter wall of said head member such that said slot is in communication with said bore of said head member, said slot extending along a length of said head member such that said slot is adapted for permitting the parking brake cable to pass through said perimeter wall into said bore of said head member", which is the "means for receiving the cable" referred to in the text of the rejection.

Also, to provide this further clarification requested in the rejection, claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 3, and claim 8 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 9. The recitations of each of these previously dependent claims recites in part "wherein said perimeter wall comprises a slot, said slot extending through said perimeter wall of said head member such that said slot is in communication with said

Appln. No. 10/782,105  
Amendment dated April 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action mailed December 16, 2005

bore of said head member, said slot extending along a length of said head member such that said slot is adapted for permitting the parking brake cable to pass through said perimeter wall into said bore of said head member", which also provides the "means for receiving the cable" requested in the final Office Action. As these requirements came from previously presented dependent claims, it is submitted that these additions do not present new issue for consideration or search, and are being made in response to the new request for further clarification of these elements in the claims.


Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 1, 4 through 8 and 10 through 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

  
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date: April 17, 2006